

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,689	DOUBLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David C. Reese	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David C. Reese. (3) _____.

(2) David Dorton. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6/30/2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Archer, Freedland et al., and Weller.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interview was conducted to discuss the merits of the instant application. More specifically, Mr. Dorton wanted to discuss the current listing of claims and to discuss possible claim amendments that would help better differentiate the instant invention from the prior art. Possible amendments included further limitations to the "compression ring" with respect to the "collet member" when in use. As well as limitations that the compression ring is non-rotatable in structural nature. Examiner stated that he would consider said amendments to the claims.